

Amendments to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) for allegedly failing to show every feature of the claimed invention. The two (2) attached sheets of drawings in **APPENDIX A** correct and replace the sheet depicting Figs. 1-3 originally filed with this application. In addition, Fig. 4 has been newly added. The changes made to the drawings are described in the Remarks.

Remarks

In this amendment, no claims have been amended, cancelled, or newly added. Therefore, claims 1-68 remain pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed application. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for allegedly not showing every feature of the claimed invention. The Office Action indicated that the following features must be shown or the features canceled from the claims: (1) the processing organ; (2) the plurality of plates positioned substantially parallel to one another; (3) the lithographic apparatus and at least one optical element; and (4) plates positioned substantially orthogonally to another plate. Applicant traverses.


Solely to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the drawings as directed by the Office Action. In particular, Fig. 1 has been amended to show a processing organ PO, such as a lithographic apparatus having an optical element (e.g., a mirror), as described in at least col. 1, lines 11-29, and 42-45; and col. 3, line 54-col. 4, line 3. Fig. 4 has been newly added to show a plurality of plates positioned substantially parallel to one another, as described in at least col. 3, lines 23-30. Furthermore, the second drawing of Fig. 3, for example, shows one or more plates positioned substantially orthogonally to another plate. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because of the conflicting recitations in column 3, lines 23-30. In particular, the cited portions of the

specification recite a filter wherein "a plurality of plates are positioned substantially parallel in relation to one another," and that "such a separate filter is characterized in that the plates are directed radially from the radiation source." Applicant has amended the specification at the Examiner's request. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

However, Applicant does not relinquish, for example, an embodiment of a filter having both a plurality of plates positioned substantially parallel in relation to one another and plates directed radially from the radiation source.



For example, the above illustration shows an embodiment having three groups of plates, wherein each group of plates has a plurality of plates positioned substantially parallel in relation to one another and each group of plates is directed radially from the radiation source. Of course, this embodiment also depicts plates directed away from the radiation source.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 1-11, and 40-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Office Action alleges that "a processing organ" and "at least one optical element configured to receive radiation

from the radiation source" are not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. Applicant traverses.

Support for "a processing organ" can be found in at least Fig. 1, and col. 1, lines 11-29; and col. 3, line 54-col. 4, line 3 (describing, for example, a lithographic apparatus). In addition, support for "at least one optical element configured to receive radiation from the radiation source" can be found in at least Fig. 1, and col. 1, lines 42-45 (describing, for example, a mirror). The specification discloses numerous embodiments. As such, these citations should not be viewed as limiting. From these disclosures, Applicant submits that a person skilled in the art would be sufficiently enabled to make the invention as claimed. Specifically, a person skilled in the art would know how to make a processing organ in the form of, for example, a lithographic apparatus, at least because the making of such an apparatus is well-known in the art. Similarly, a person skilled in the art would know how to make an optical element configured to receive radiation from a radiation source in the form of, for example, a mirror, at least because the making of a mirror is well-known in the art.

For at least the reason that the specification and drawings provide support for and enable the identified claim aspects, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Having addressed each of the foregoing objections and rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.


If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

If an extension of time is necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such an extension of time is hereby petitioned for under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 033975 (Ref. No. **081468-0308088**).

Date: July 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Jean-Paul G. Hoffman
Registration No. 42,663

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102

Direct: (703) 770-7794
Main: (703) 770-7900
Fax: (703) 770-7901

Appendix A

